DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 295 CE 052 655

TITLE Delivery Systems Assisted under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act and Job Training Partnership Act.

INSTITUTION Virginia State Council on Vocational Education, Richmond.

PUB DATE 89

NOTE 51p.

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Articulation (Education); Community Colleges; *Compliance (Legal); Coordination; *Delivery Systems; *Federal Legislation; Postsecondary Education; Program Implementation; *Program Improvement; Secondary Education; State Programs; *Vocational Education

IDENTIFIERS *Carl D Perkins Vocational Education Act 1984; Job Training Partnership Act 1982; *Virginia

ABSTRACT

This report presents an overview of the vocational education delivery systems assisted under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) in Virginia. For the Perkins Act, the report reviews the purpose, delivery system, and the implementation of vocational education (enrollments, quality of programs for target populations, services for handicapped students, program improvement, community-based organizations, consumer and homemaking education, exemplary initiatives, reports from vocational education advisory councils, and distribution and expenditures of funds). It also makes recommendations concerning vocational education for the handicapped, business internships for teachers, credits for private sector training, adult vocational programs for older workers, innovative program designs, secondary-community college coordination, apprenticeships, vocational follow-up, career development guidelines, student organizations, and employment counseling and placement services. For the JTPA, the report reviews the purpose, delivery system, the working of the act (participants served, types of training provided, coordination between JTPA and vocational education, state education coordination grants, and other JTPA provisions), and makes recommendations concerning expanding coordination between vocational education and JTPA programs. The report also outlines the yearly activities of the reviewing council in the state. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308295

DELIVERY SYSTEMS

ASSISTED UNDER THE

CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

AND

JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

VA Council on Vocational Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

VIRGINIA COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

1989 REPORT

VIRGINIA COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

CLARENCE W. FARMER
Chair, United Paperworkers International Union, Local 675, Covington.

ANN Y. GREGORY
Vice-Chair, Editor & co-publisher, Clinch Valley Times, St. Paul.

HERBERT G. BARNES
Farmer and businessman, Alberta.

PHILLIP J. BURNETTE
President, VRAIN Corporation, Martinsville.

JOHN D. DAVENPORT
Administrator, Virginia Chapter of the National Glass Association, Richmond.

ROGER W. JOHNSON
Vocational guidance counselor, Bedford County Schools, Bedford.

SUSAN A. KIDD
Supervisor, Vocational & Adult Education, Botetourt County Schools, BlueRidge.

FREDDIE W. NICHOLAS, SR.
President, John Tyler Community College, Chester.

CAROLYN B. PIPPEN
Supervisor, Special Education, Prince William County Schools, Culpeper.

JOHN H. TYSON
Plant Manager, Technicon Instruments Corporation, Winchester.

PHILLIP D. VAUGHN
Director, Tidewater Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee for Carpentry, Norfolk.

WILLIAM A. WAGNER
Vice President, Automotive Training Institute, Virginia Beach.

SYLVIA S. WEINTSTEIN
Kent/Weinstein Communications, Newport News.

DELIVERY SYSTEMS

ASSISTED UNDER THE

CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

AND

JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

VIRGINIA COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

1989 REPORT

The Virginia Council on Vocational Education was created by Congress through the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 and continued through the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984. Its members, drawn from a cross section of the public, are appointed by the Governor. The Council is charged by law to advise the Governor, the State Board of Vocational Education, the Governor's Job Training Coordinating Council, the U. S. Secretary of Education, the U. S. Secretary of Labor, the business community, and the general public concerning the operation of vocational education programs, services, and activities.

FOREWORD

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act directs the Virginia Council on Vocational Education to evaluate at least once every two years, the vocational education program delivery systems assisted under this Act and under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) in terms of their adequacy and effectiveness in meeting the purposes of the two Acts. Recommendations are to be made to the Virginia Board of (Vocational) Education on the adequacy and effectiveness of coordination between vocational education and the JTPA.

The information included in this report has been obtained from records and reports of state agencies; interviews; public meetings; participation of council members and staff in vocational programs and activities; and evaluations, studies, and surveys conducted by the council. Staff of the Virginia Department of Education and the Governor's Employment Training Department have been extremely cooperative and responded to numerous requests for data and assistance.

Special thanks is extended to individuals and groups who have provided information through surveys, interviews, and personal requests. Among these are the special education and vocational education personnel in school divisions; vocational education and special education advisory councils and their chairs; labor representatives of the AFL-CIO; Virginia Occupational Information Coordinating Committee staff; business and industry representatives across the state; school division vocational education administrators; community college deans and provosts; and the Job Training Partnership Act service delivery area administrators.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD iii

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION DELIVERY SYSTEM UNDER THE CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

A. PURPOSE 1

B. DELIVERY SYSTEM 1

C. REVIEW OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION 2

Enrollments 2

Quality Programs For Target Populations 2

Study Of Vocational Education Programs And Services For Handicapped Students 3

Program Improvement 5

Community Based Organizations 6

Consumer And Homemaking Education 6

Exemplary Initiatives 6

Analysis Of 1987-88 Reports From Vocational Education Advisory Councils 7

Review Of Distribution And Expenditure Of Carl D. Perkins Act Funds 8

D. RECOMMENDATIONS 11

1988 Recommendations 11

1989 Recommendations 13

Recommendations From Study Of Vocational Education Services Provided Handicapped Students 16

JTPA DELIVERY SYSTEM UNDER THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

A. PURPOSE 19

B. DELIVERY SYSTEM 19

C. REVIEW OF JTPA 20

Participants Served Through JTPA 20

Types Of Training Programs Provided 24

Coordination Between JTPA And Vocational Education 25

State Education Coordination Grants 28

Other JTPA Provisions 30

D. RECOMMENDATIONS 35

Recommendations To Expand Coordination Between Vocational Education And JTPA Programs 35

COUNCIL ACTIVITIES

A. PUBLIC MEETINGS AND PROGRAM VISITS 37

B. STATE PLAN CONSULTATION 37

C. CONTACTS WITH ORGANIZED LABOR 38

D. SURVEY OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVES 39

E. BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY PARTNERSHIP AWARDS 41

APPENDIX

VIRGINIA JTPA SERVICE DELIVERY AREAS 45

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION DELIVERY SYSTEM UNDER THE CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

A. PURPOSE

The general purpose of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act is to assist the states to expand, improve, modernize, and develop quality vocational education programs in order to meet the needs of the Nation's existing and future work force for marketable skills and to improve productivity and promote economic growth. Other specific purposes include providing target populations access to quality vocational programs; promoting cooperation between public agencies and the private sector; making vocational programs more responsive to the labor market; improving the academic foundations of vocational students; train, retrain, and upgrade employed and unemployed workers; assist economically depressed areas of the state to raise employment and occupational opportunities of its citizens; utilize support services, special programs, and counseling and placement to achieve the purposes of the Act; and improve the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking programs.

B. DELIVERY SYSTEM

The Virginia Board of Education serves as the State Board of Vocational Education. It is responsible for developing a state plan for vocational education that provides for programs and services in local school divisions, the Virginia Community College System, the Virginia Schools for the Deaf and Blind at Hampton and Staunton, Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center, institutions of higher education for vocational teacher education, the Department of Correctional Education, and apprenticeship programs jointly supported with the Virginia Department of Labor and Industry.

In the 1987-88 school year two hundred eighty-nine high schools, thirty-six separate vocational centers, eleven jointly owned centers, and twenty-three community colleges provided programs of vocational-technical education. Thirty-seven high schools with vocational education wings served the entire school division. Two hundred fifteen middle schools had exploratory or special needs programs, and twelve separate centers provided special services to disadvantaged and handicapped students. State institutions served criminal offenders, deaf and blind individuals, and other handicapped persons.

C. REVIEW OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

ENROLLMENTS

Secondary enrollments in 1987-88 totaled 341,747 and postsecondary/adult programs enrolled 176,067. Target populations served within these totals were:

Target Populations	Secondary	Postsecondary/Adult
Handicapped	18,719	1,168
Disadvantaged	51,425	18,602
Limited English Proficient	3,342	0
Adults	0	64,947
Single Parents/Homemaker	0	2,411
Criminal Offenders*	1,699	
Non-traditional Programs**		

* Levels not identified

** Numerous activities were conducted through projects to assist women explore non-traditional trade & industrial related careers, explore high technology careers, and eliminate sex bias and enhance sex equity for men and women which did not result in enrollment figures.

Secondary vocational student organizations had a membership total of 100,601. Another 1,951 persons were members of two adult vocational organizations.

Cooperative secondary vocational education programs enrolled 18,422 students. These students were employed by 11,860 employers and earned $49 million in 1987-88.

QUALITY PROGRAMS FOR TARGET POPULATIONS

One hundred thirty of the 135 school divisions accepted entitlements to support half the excess costs for special services and/or programs for handicapped students. Assessment services provided by school-based vocational evaluation centers assisted in determining appropriate placement of handicapped students. Collaboration between vocational education, special education, and interagency groups resulted in several successful projects that focused on transition opportunities from school to work for youth and young adults with disabilities. A handbook listing formal and informal assessment instruments was developed and disseminated to evaluators, counselors, and administrators.

Entitlements for disadvantaged students were distributed to 130 school divisions. These funds supported half of the excess costs for special programs or services needed by these students. Some of these services were student assessments, resources or support

personnel for vocational teachers, modification of equipment, purchase of specially designed equipment, curriculum modification, job development, and guidance and counseling services.

Limited English proficiency students were provided services to improve access and assist in successful participation in vocational programs. Support personnel; remedial services in English, math, and reading; modification of curriculum; resource materials; and work experience were typical of these services.

Adults were served through programs provided through school divisions, community colleges, and some higher education institutions. Apprenticeship training initiatives were expanded during 1987-88 in recognition of the significant impact this program makes in preparing skilled workers.

Financial support was provided to forty-eight projects targeting sex equity concerns. These included twenty regional centers for single parents and homemakers, eight mini-grants to eliminate sex bias and to enhance sex equity for men and women, nine programs of non-traditional training for women, one project involving twelve school divisions in the implementation of Women In Non-traditional Careers curriculum, support for a statewide sex equity resource center, a statewide program to assist teachers and counselors in promoting vocational sex equity, seven programs serving teenage parents, and the updating of business education sex equity recruitment materials.

The Department of Correctional Education provided vocational education programs for criminal offenders in state youth and adult institutions. Carl Perkins funds supported instructor salaries, equipment purchases, and instructional supplies and materials for programs in eighteen adult and five youth institutions. A total of 1,699 individuals were served by these programs.

STUDY OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND SERVICES FOR HANDICAPPED STUDENTS

In the fall of 1986, the State Special Education Advisory Committee and the Virginia Council on Vocational Education held informal discussions about vocational services provided to handicapped students. Mutual interests resulted in an agreement to jointly survey school divisions about handicapped students in the spring of 1987. The emphasis was on vocational education programs and services available to these individuals and the identification of unmet needs. Ninety-eight survey forms representing 106 of the 139 school divisions were received for a response rate of 76 percent.

The survey data indicates a number of positive findings and identifies issues that need attention to enhance and expand the provision of vocational education services to handicapped students. Handicapped students are currently enrolled in a variety of prevocational and occupational preparation programs. The 8,550 students reported in prevocational areas

and the 8,023 in occupational preparation reflect a substantial effort underway to provide vocational education to handicapped students. More than 6,500 students with handicapping conditions are not participating in vocational education. Of this number, nearly 3,000 students were identified as needing prevocational services or occupational preparation programs.

Responses show that four-out-of-five handicapped students are enrolled with students who are not handicapped. This is positive, but a number of issues were listed that prohibit mainstreaming of handicapped students or impact on how effectively this takes place. Dominant among these were the need for vocational educators to receive inservice training about how to modify instruction, curriculum, and materials; and the need for both vocational and special educators to be cross-trained together to promote better understanding, communication, and cooperation.

Responses about handicapped students completing vocational courses, programs, and having marketable skills also reflect positive results. More information is required to determine the level of success this may represent. Of some concern is the information about the status, after graduation or leaving school, of students completing a vocational program. No information was available for one-third of these students. Forty percent were employed, eleven percent were enrolled in postsecondary education programs, and thirteen percent were unemployed.

Career awareness, orientation, and vocational training are services identified as provided to handicapped students by nearly every school division responding to the survey. Respondents also identified unmet needs. Work related transportation services, supported work services, job maintenance, and work adjustment led this list.

Some handicapped students enrolled in vocational education do not have a vocational component written into their individual education program (IEP). The survey did not attempt to determine why a vocational component was not included. Seventy-five percent of the respondents indicated all or most do have such a component in the IEP.

Modifications may be needed in vocational education programs for them to effectively serve handicapped students. Responses to a question about modifications show curriculum modifications are made "often" in about half the school divisions. Other modifications happen "often" in only one-third of the school divisions.

Career awareness and orientation were cited as vocational services most often provided handicapped students. Nearly eighty percent of the respondents reported they have an organized program to inform students and parents about available vocational services.

Two-thirds of the surveys reported efforts are being made to acquaint employers with the needs and employment potential of the disabled. Most of this is done through school-based cooperative education programs or vocational rehabilitation services.

Cooperative efforts between special and vocational instructional, supervisory, and administrative personnel are critical to providing quality vocational services for handicapped students. These individuals are working together, but there still is much to be done to enhance these efforts. This is apparent when reviewing the identification of needed personnel training. Many of the topics include expanded mutual understanding about vocational programs, special education issues, and how to better serve handicapped students.

Vocational education services for students with severe disabilities was a topic included in the survey. The responses show severely disabled students do have some access to vocational programs and services. The population categorized as "moderate to severe retardation" had the largest number enrolled.

Vocational assessment services and Education for Employemt (EFE) were identified most often as innovative programs. A variety of other special programs and projects were also listed. The responses included few, if any, truly innovative programs or services.

A unique feature of the survey was it directed questions to the special and vocational education advisory groups for the school division. Their top three issues, problems, or barriers to providing high quality vocational programs and services to the handicapped were programmatic barriers, vocational educator training needs, and funding. When asked to identify barriers to insuring employment for the handicapped in the community, the advisory groups cited limited job openings; lack of understanding, awareness, and acceptance of the handicapped by employers; and insufficient transition services available to help handicapped students find and maintain employment. Both advisory bodies reported they plan to play advocacy roles, support expanded inservice training for education personnel, and conduct public awareness activities to improve the quality of vocational education for handicapped students.

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

A number of initiatives were completed to instill elements in current practice that result in vocational program improvements.

Twenty career guidance projects were conducted. Eight of these in elementary and middle schools centered on working with a range of students from handicapped and disadvantaged to gifted and talented. Another eight projects in elementary, middle school, high school, and the community college level concentrated on service for special needs students, the remaining four projects provided job counseling and placement services.

Personnel development activities ranged from pre-service teacher training to developing a framework for dual enrollments of high school students in community college vocational-technical courses. One hundred fifty staff development activities were conducted for secondary school teachers, supervisors, administrators, and teacher educators. The participants in these activities totaled 6,734 in 1987-88. Twelve additional workshops, conferences, and projects were held for personnel in the community colleges.

Thirty curriculum guides were developed in 1987-88. The materials developed were in direct response to identified curriculum needs. Technical committees, composed of experts from business and industry, met to identify task lists or essential skills for occupation in agricultural business, carpentry, plumbing, and electronics.

Program improvement funds were used to support the purchase of replacement or new equipment for secondary programs in school divisions. Approximately thirty-one percent of the total amount of funds requested for equipment was available. This category represented the largest expenditure of program improvement funds.

A number of other initiatives were undertaken to bring about program improvements. Some of these were the establishment of new state regulations for secondary programs, a plan to expand coordination between secondary schools and community colleges, and evaluation of twenty-five school divisions and three vocational-technical centers.

COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS

Two projects involving community based organizations were conducted. These were established to improve the quality of vocational education for handicapped and disadvantaged students through coordinated services from schools, other agencies, and employers. One project worked with disadvantaged youth to facilitate entrance into vocational education, employment, or other employment training. The other project provided English as a second language, job readiness skills, independent living skills, assessment, and counseling to limited English proficient students.

CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION

All one hundred thirty-five school divisions provided secondary vocational consumer and homemaking education programs. These programs contribute to the preparation of youth and adults for the occupation of homemaking. Emphasis is placed on individual and family life, and enhancing employability. The 1987-88 enrollment total was 67,124.

EXEMPLARY INITIATIVES

The council is impressed with several initiatives that have or will make a significant impact on Virginia's program of vocational-technical education. Among these are the efforts to strengthen basic skills, which is directed to teachers in all disciplines; the expansion of career assessment centers; coordination between secondary and community college curriculums, including starting ten new "2+2" programs; the electronics curriculum project conducted with the U. S. Army; the inclusion of technical arts as a special area of gifted education; the initiatives related to international education in two curriculum areas; and the marketing program for vocational education.

ANALYSIS OF 1987-88 REPORTS FROM VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COUNCILS

Several years ago the council assisted the Virginia Board of (Vocational) Education in the development of an annual report format for local vocational education advisory councils. Each year the summary data from these reports is reviewed with the Board. The 1987-88 reports show a continuing formal involvement of representatives from business, industry, labor, and the general public with vocational-technical education.

132 vocational education advisory councils
1,638 council members (1/3 female, 2/3 male)

71% (1,169 members) represent business (615), industry (338), labor (216)
29% (469 members) represent the general public

21% (28 councils) met five or more times during the year
55% (72 councils) met three or four times during the year
59% (78 councils) averaged attendance of 70% or better
82% (108 councils) averaged attendance of 60% or better

55% (72 councils) submitted an annual report to the school board
74% (97 councils) submitted reports to the school administration
70% (93 councils) presented recommendations to the school board

Recommendations made most often related to new program offerings through expansion, modification of existing programs, and updating equipment.

Major activities conducted by councils were sponsoring job opportunity conventions, career days, or job fairs; participating in the development of the local vocational plans; assisting with job placement; reviewing program plans and evaluation results; and locally validating state curriculum competencies.

Councils indicate they need help in identifying labor market needs and employment opportunities, evaluating programs, assessing the relevance of programs, revitalizing the advisory council, organizing occupational and program advisory committees, and planning a program of work for the council.

There were 897 craft or program advisory committees with 4,737 members in addition to the 1,638 general advisory council members for a total of 6,375 private sector individuals involved with vocational education in the public schools. Another 4,600 plus individuals serve on occupational-technical committees in the community colleges to total 11,000 people involved with vocational-technical education in some advisory capacity.

REVIEW OF DISTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE OF CARL D. PERKINS ACT FUNDS

The federal grant award provides funds to support Title II and Title III of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act. Title II is identified as the basic grant. Federal provisions allow the balance of funds unexpended in a fiscal year to be carried forward for expenditure in the following fiscal year. Carryover balances must be expended consistent with setaside requirements and other provisions of the Act.

Federal expenditures for state administration cannot exceed seven percent of the basic grant. At least $60,000 of administration funds must be expended for a gender equity unit. The remainder of the basic grant is to be expended consistent with setaside requirements in Title II, Part A, and program improvement services and activities identified in Title II, Part B. Expenditures for guidance and counseling services must be at least equal to FY 1984 expenditures for such activities.

All of the handicapped and disadvantaged setasides must be distributed to local educational agencies by a federal formula. These entitlements may be used to pay up to fifty percent of the excess costs for programs, services, and activities for handicapped and disadvantaged students.

Title III, Part A, provides grants for vocational education programs conducted cooperatively by local educational agencies and community based organizations. Title III, Part B, supports consumer and homemaking education programs and services. At least one-third of the grants from these funds must be distributed to economically depressed areas.

Not less than eighty percent of the total basic grant must be distributed to local recipients. At least fifty-one percent of the state's distribution must go to local recipients in economically depressed areas of the state. An overall non-federal match is required for Title II, Part B, expenditures. The state must also maintain fiscal efforts so federal funds do not supplant non-federal funds.

The analysis of the distribution of available federal funds identifies the major portion is provided to school divisions to support secondary vocational education programs and services. In 1986-87, the current year grant and carryover funds totaled $23,373,280. Title II, the basic grant, was $20,977,867 or 89.9 percent of available funds. Secondary schools received 71.3 percent, postsecondary programs in community colleges were allocated 11.8 percent, and other agencies and institutions received 16.8 percent of the funds. In 1987-88, available federal funds were $24,769,691. The basic grant was $22,211,822 or 89.7 percent. Secondary programs were allocated 65.3 percent, community colleges received 15.1 percent, and other agencies and institutions had 19.6 percent of these funds.

Allocation And Expenditure Of 1986-87 Federal Funds

Category	Allocation *	Expenditure
State Administration	$ 1,126,226	$ 848,173
Gender Equity Unit	73,773	73,006
Title II-A		
Disadvantaged	5,118,764	3,653,128
Apprenticeship	628,618	579,738
Adult	374,282	361,968
Handicapped	2,268,913	1,832,661
Corrections	219,248	186,028
Postsecondary	1,079,000	1,079,000
Gender Equity Projects	966,040	569,165
Single Parent Projects	2,183,280	1,416,696
Title II-B		
Personnel Development	1,408,000	1,120,747
Program Improvement	5,406,494	4,677,951
Curriculum Development	690,000	494,513
Guidance And Counseling	635,228	339,830
Title III-A		
Community Based Organizations	165,530	153,071
Title III-B		
Consumer And Homemaking	1,029,883	896,421
Total	$23,373,280	$18,282,096

* Includes FY 1987 appropriation and FY 1986 carryover funds

Allocation And Expenditure Of 1987-88 Federal Funds

Category	Allocation *	Expenditures
State Administration	$ 1,297,902	$ 841,786
Gender Equity Unit	90,767	79,564
Title II-A		
Disadvantaged	5,325,620	4,530,203
Apprenticeship	717,373	717,373
Adult	290,265	290,265
Handicapped	2,190,790	2,113,971
Corrections	208,672	169,335
Postsecondary	1,159,002	1,134,142
Gender Equity Projects	1,010,963	878,467
Single Parent Projects	2,257,942	1,864,110
Title II-B		
Personnel Development	1,803,245	1,343,614
Program Improvement	5,474,143	4,299,566
Curriculum Development	938,409	609,384
Guidance And Counseling	835,398	321,966
Title III-A		
Community Based Organizations	150,456	117,202
Title III-B		
Consumer And Homemaking	1,018,744	903,802
Total	$24,769,691	$20,214,750

* Includes FY 1988 appropriation and FY 1987 carryover funds

D. RECOMMENDATIONS

The council annually makes recommendations to the Virginia Board of (Vocational) Education. The recommendations evolved from issues and concerns identified in council meetings, public meetings, program visits, studies, and other activities conducted throughout the state. The recommendations from the study of services provided handicapped students were jointly presented to the Virginia Board of Education by the council and the State Special Education Advisory Committee.

1988 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Least Restrictive Environment For Handicapped Students

Handicapped students are enrolled in vocational education courses with students who are not handicapped and in separate courses where all enrollees have a handicapping condition. Mainstreaming, described as including handicapped and non-handicapped in the same class, is preferred over separate classes. Generally, this is the least restrictive environment for these students. A recent survey shows more than 85 percent of handicapped students in vocational education courses are enrolled in classes with non-handicapped students.

Placement of handicapped students into regular vocational courses may require special equipment and/or support services from resource personnel to assure student success. In many situations, support services are limited or non-existent. This creates a problem for teachers that must accommodate the special needs of the handicapped students. Separate vocational classes for handicappped students have a maximum enrollment of ten students. Regular classes with a maximum of 20 or more students could have five to ten handicapped students enrolled within that number. Without the assistance of resource personnel, this places an unrealistic burden on the teacher and other students.

The council, therefore, recommends that handicapped students enrolled in a regular vocational education course represent two students for the purpose of determining class size unless additional resource personnel is assigned to assist the teacher meet the special needs of these students.

2. Business Internships

In this age of rapid technological change, it is important that teachers of vocational education stay current in their fields of expertise. Craft and program advisory committees are valuable resources for teachers in this regard, but other approaches are also needed. The council believes that teachers could benefit greatly from a form of business internship. The internship should relate closely to the teaching assignment and be structured to qualify as part of the teacher's recertification process. The business internship approach could also

effectively assist guidance counselors and vocational administrators to stay current with what is taking place in the business community. Each internship would need to be designed to meet the needs of the individual and the work assignment. The establishment of internships would also assist in building greater business-education partnerships.

The council, therefore, recommends that business internships be encouraged for vocational education teachers, administrators, and guidance counselors as part of the recertification process; and that a small financial incentive be established to support this concept at several demonstration sites.

3. Transfer Of Credit For Private Sector Training

The council believes it is time to maximize the educational resources in the state by incorporating the various occupational preparation sources into a fully articulated delivery system. Efforts have already begun to establish statewide vocational program articulation between the public secondary schools and community colleges. The next logical step is to expand this process to include private sector training sources. The private sources include private career schools, the military, and training provided by business and industry. Not all training in the private sector merits such consideration, but much of it does warrant transfer acceptability from public postsecondary institutions.

The council, therefore, recommends that a review be made of private sector training transfer policies in other states, and a committee with representation from appropriate agencies and organizations be established to explore the establishment of such a policy in Virginia.

4. Adult Vocational Programs For Older Workers

The council, over the past two years, has supported an increased emphasis in vocational education for training, retraining, and upgrading workers. This concern for expanded adult vocational programs is reinforced by the need to have a skilled work force to enhance Virginia's potential for economic growth. It also relates directly to the personal benefits citizens of this state derive from their role in the labor market.

Preliminary plans for the 1988-90 expenditure of vocational education funds include provisions for new adult training and retraining initiatives. The council believes the specific details of these initiatives should provide some emphasis on adult vocational education for older workers. These efforts might be through demonstration projects or through joint relationships with other agencies concerned with serving older workers, such as the Virginia Department for the Aging or the Governor's Job Training Coordinating Council.

The council, therefore, recommends that the adult vocational education initiatives in the 1988-90 state plan incorporate provisions related to training and retraining needs of older workers.

5. Innovative Program Designs For Vocational Education

Vocational education at the secondary level should be programmatically designed to serve the diverse needs of a substantial majority of the student population in grades 9-12. Required setaside expenditures in federal legislation target funds to serve disadvantaged and handicapped students as well as other special populations. Thirty percent of the students completing vocational programs during the past several years continue further education while seventy percent are available to enter the work force. Virginia is a leader in the development of vocational programs for gifted and talented students, and new program flexibility has been identified in response to increased graduation requirements. These combined efforts have made secondary vocational education more available and more attractive to all students.

The council believes that additional efforts could further expand availability and create new interest in vocational education in students who have not considered the program in the past. Some ideas that might be explored are using vocational centers for new innovative high-tech programs that involve laboratory experimentation or combine science and math curriculums, modifying programs by compressing curriculum content and reducing class time to single periods for one year, and creating new curriculum mixes that better serve students' future needs whether they continue education or seek employment. Some innovative examples are already in place and should be reviewed to assess their potential for replication. The recently approved graduation requirement for one unit of fine or practical arts is another reason to look critically at new program designs.

The council, therefore, recommends that the State Board of Vocational Education request the vocational staff of he Virginia Department of Education to utilize its personnel, representatives from school divisions, and others to identify new programmatic designs and curriculums that will expand availability and create new interest among secondary students.

1989 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Secondary/Community College Coordination

Efforts to expand articulation between public school and community college vocational-technical education in 1987-88 resulted in a number of new initiatives being started. Achievements included planning for additional "2 + 2" programs, discussions about dual enrollments, staff development sessions, and developing curriculum models to extend coordination. Elements of the plan continue into 1988-89 and 1989-90 when, for example, five "2 + 2" programs are to begin each year. The council feels these joint efforts to strengthen coordination have been successful and should continue.

Projections about the work force in the year 2000 indicate the best jobs will require higher levels of occupational skills. Education and training beyond high school will be needed for these jobs. This information supports the importance of a continuous plan to

expand and strengthen linkages between secondary and community college vocational-technical education programs.

The council therefore recommends the Board, in cooperation with the State Board for Community Colleges, develop a plan of activities to further expand the coordinated delivery of vocational-technical education in secondary schools and community colleges for fiscal years 1991 and 1992, and each two-year period thereafter.

2. Apprenticeship Training

The council believes information about the work force in the year 2000 requires expanded efforts to link more closely secondary vocational education with apprenticeship training programs. Since the better jobs will require some training beyond high school, the apprenticeship program should become a more prominent option for high school graduates to develop higher level occupational skills. This will require increased communication about apprenticeship training with guidance counselors and vocational education teachers as well as other related initiatives.

The council therefore recommends the Board request the vocational education staff bring a group of state and local representatives from education, apprenticeship training, and employers together for the purpose of identifying activities that should take place to link more closely secondary vocational education and apprenticeship training programs.

3. Tracking Completers Of Vocational-Technical Programs

A recent study of labor market information in Virginia by the Virginia Occupational Information System project at the Center for Public Service, University of Virginia, describes the existing system and identifies issues related to needed improvements. The issue of missing labor market information cites the need for data about the occupational futures of secondary and postsecondary vocational-technical education program completers. The council has expressed concern in the past about the void of information available on persons completing vocational programs.

A new approach used to assess investments in human capital is emerging. It involves existing data about workers. Follow-up studies utilizing unemployment insurance files are providing this information in a systematic and efficient manner in several states, including Virginia. Most notable are the efforts in Florida where unemployment insurance files and related data are the foundation of the Occupational Identifier Project. The results are used as one measure of program performance. The Virginia Employment Commission is conducting a similar follow-up on a limited number of community college graduates. This pilot effort entitled the Vocational-Technical Education Program Completer Tracking System will provide uniform information for evaluating elements of program effectiveness and judging the return on investment in human capital. The council believes Virginia should expand these initiatives. To do so it will require providing resources to the VEC to establish a program completer tracking system for all training programs.

The council therefore recommends the Board, State Board for Community Colleges, and the Governor's Job Training Coordinating Council support the development of a completer tracking system for all training programs which utilizes unemployment insurance files and other related data.

4. Career Development Guidelines

A movement has been underway during the past several years to establish national guidelines for a career development program that could be adopted in each state. Federal funds from the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act are supporting this effort which involves the National Occupational Information Coordinating Council and ten demonstration sites across the country.

The council has had the opportunity to become aware of these guidelines, and it believes they support comprehensive career development activities. Virginia already has many of the career development components in place within its elementary and secondary guidance program. Adoption of the guidelines would help localities improve the delivery of these services through new counselor competencies, detailed student competencies, and expanded student career awareness outcomes. Since the guidelines include postsecondary and adult level programs they offer the potential to effectively coordinate career development services between the public schools and other educational and training institutions.

The council therefore recommends the Board review the career development guidelines for consistency with existing policies and adopt them as a means to improve the career guidance and counseling program in Virginia.

5. Vocational Education Student Organizations

Secondary vocational education student organizations provide co-curricula opportunities that assist students to develop leadership traits, improve interpersonal relationship skills, and become involved in community service activities. These benefits along with organization sponsored events and competition at the local, regional, state, national, and international levels expand the educational experiences of student members.

Except for a number of chapters of Phi Beta Lamda for business education students in community colleges, there are few opportunities for postsecondary students to affiliate with vocational education student organizations. The council believes the establishment of postsecondary student organizations would further strengthen the coordination of secondary and postsecondary vocational education programs in a variety of institutional settings. These include community colleges, private career schools, and apprenticeship training programs.

The council therefore recommends the Board direct the vocational education staff to explore the expansion of vocational education student organizations at the postsecondary level.

6. Employment Counseling And Placement Services

The provision of employment counseling and placement services has been an issue of interest to the council since 1970 when it included a recommendation on job placement in its first report. In the mid-1970s a bill was passed by the General Assembly requiring each school board to "make available to secondary students employment counseling and placement services..." Guidance counselors were assigned this responsibility, but other duties limit the time available to provide such services. The result has been extreme variations in how this requirement is being met. Acknowledging this, the council in 1983 recommended the Board assess the provision of these services and identify model programs for school divisions to emulate.

The Vocational Education Evaluation in Virginia (VEEVA) system each year evaluates programs in one fifth of the school divisions. The evaluation summaries have consistently identified career counseling and placement services as needing improvement. The current report suggests job placement services could be improved through increased contact with potential employers by teachers and counselors. The council believes the requirement to provide employment counseling and placement services can best be met through a coordinated team effort within a school division. Guidance counselors, vocational education teachers, representatives of the Virginia Employment Commission, job placement coordinators, and where they exist in a school division, vocational counseling specialists must work together to provide these services. What seems to be needed is a plan for implementing a program at the local level to meet this requirement.

The council therefore recommends the Board outline a system for delivering employment counseling and placement services to students entering the labor market after leaving school that includes a variety of options for school divisions to use or adapt to meet this requirement.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM STUDY OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SERVICES PROVIDED HANDICAPPED STUDENTS

The State Special Education Advisory Committee and the Virginia Council on Vocational Education recommend the Virginia Board of Education take the following action to expand and enhance quality vocational education programs and services for handicapped students:

1. Inservice Training Programs

Establish joint inservice training programs for special and vocational education teachers, supervisors, and administrators to develop mutual understanding about students, programs, and services to expand participation of the handicapped in vocational education and enhance the quality of services provided.

2. Innovative Programs And Projects

Identify funds for truly innovative programs and projects to serve unmet vocational needs of handicapped students.

3. Transitional Services

Develop and provide support for a plan to expand transitional services for handicapped students from school to work.

JTPA DELIVERY SYSTEM
UNDER THE
JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

A. PURPOSE

The purpose of the Job Training Partnership Act is to establish programs to prepare youth and unskilled adults for entry into the labor force, and to offer job training to economically disadvantaged individuals and others facing serious barriers to employment, who are in need of training to obtain productive employment. In addition to the economically disadvantaged, the Act provides employment and training services for dislocated and older workers. Native Americans, veterans, and migrant and seasonal farmworkers receive services through statewide grants administered at the federal level.

Other provisions of the law may also be viewed as purposes. These include: employment and training is provided for those who can benefit from and are in most need of the opportunities; programs should contribute toward upward mobility, new careers, and overcoming gender stereotyping in occupations traditional for the other sex; emphasis on private sector involvement through private industry councils; coordination efforts among public agencies and organizations providing job training; and performance standards to measure the productivity of the investment in JTPA.

B. DELIVERY SYSTEM

Virginia is divided into fourteen service delivery areas (SDAs). A listing of counties and cities in each SDA is included in the Appendix.

1. SDA - One, Inc.
2. New River/Mount Rogers Employment and Training Consortium
3. Fifth District Employment and Training Consortium
4. Shenandoah Valley Service Delivery Area
5. Northern Virginia Manpower Consortium
6. Alexandria/Arlington Job Training Consortium
7. Piedmont Job Training Administration
8. Central Piedmont Employment Consortium
9. South Central Employment and Training Consortium
10. Job and Training Assistance Programs
11. Capital Area Training Consortium
12. Bay Consortium Private Industry Council, Inc.
13. Job Training Service
14. Southeastern Virginia Job Training Administration

Private industry councils (PICs) determine how the JTPA programs will operate in each SDA. A majority of the membership of these councils is from the private sector. Representatives of educational agencies, organized labor, rehabilitation agencies, economic development agencies, and community based organization comprise the remainder of the membership.

At the state level, the Governor's Job Training Coordinating Council (GJTCC) advises on delivery of services, performance standards, coordination, and other issues related to job training. The Governor's Employment and Training Department (GETD) is the agency responsible for oversight of the JTPA program.

Approximately 100 different service providing contractors are utilized by SDAs to deliver assessment, counseling, occupational skills training, on-the-job training, basic education, work experience, employability development, job search, and job development services.

C. REVIEW OF JTPA

The Virginia Council on Vocational Education conducted interviews with administrators of the Job Training Partnership Act in all fourteen service delivery areas across the state. Five categories of questions sought information about participants served by JTPA, types of training programs provided, coordination between JTPA and vocational education, state education coordination grants, and general information about JTPA.

PARTICIPANTS SERVED THROUGH JTPA

1. What is the general make-up of the youth and adult eligible population?

The responses varied due to the diversity of the geographic region included in each service delivery area (SDA). Statewide data from the Governor's Job Training Coordinating Council for Program Year 1987 identifies approximately 50 percent of the participants between the ages of 22-54, 48 percent between 14-21, and about one percent age 55 and over. Sixty-one percent of the participants were female, 47 percent black, and other minorities totaled three percent. Forty-six percent were high school graduates, 35 percent dropouts, and 18 percent students.

Individual SDA responses highlight some of the differences that exist. One SDA indicated 75 percent of the service delivery area is over 40 years of age and 92 percent white. Another noted 28 percent of the SDA is youth. Foreign born in two SDAs represent more than 50 percent of the clients served. Another is predominantly serving minorities with a high percentage of welfare recipients. Most SDAs see two to three times the numbers of individuals they serve.

Characteristics Of II-A Participants
Program Year 1987 (July 1, 1987 - June 30, 1988)

Total Participants	16,529
Gender	Percent
Male	39.3
Female	60.7
Age	
14-21 Years	48.2
22-54 Years	50.4
55 Years or More	1.4
Race	
Black	47.3
White	49.6
Other	3.0
Education	
High School Graduate or More	46.2
School Dropout	35.5
In-School	18.3
Employment Status	
Unemployed	64.0
Not in Labor Force	23.0
Employed	13.0
Other Characteristics	
Foods Stamp Recipient	35.8
Single Head of Household	25.8
Aid for Dependent Children	22.9
Handicapped/Disabled	16.1
Offender	7.1

2. How do you identify and communicate with the eligible population?

All SDAs report sub-contractors and service providing agencies do a substantial amount of identification and communication with the eligible population. An approach identified as most successful by some SDAs is to have persons completing programs to talk with others about the experience. Census data and other demographic information helps

identify characteristics of the general population of a region. Newspaper ads, television announcements, radio spots, and other marketing techniques are used for special projects or when recruiting hard-to-reach groups such as youths or welfare recipients.

3. Do the training plan and implementation strategies provide for equitable services among the various segments of the eligible population? Explain the response in relation to the makeup of the eligible population. If any segments of the eligible population are underserved for any reason, identify them and explain the circumstances involved.

Responses to this question uniformly indicated plans and strategies are consistent with the equitable services provision in the law. A number of problems in achieving this provision were identified. Many SDAs have some difficulty in meeting the state target levels for serving dropouts. While youth are generally better educated, they are harder to recruit and more difficult to retain in programs. The ability and commitment of localities to serve dropouts is a factor in some instances. One SDA noted the low incidence of the young black male in the program. Older dropouts are extremely difficult to enroll and lack of service to this group for some SDAs results in not reaching the identified dropout levels. Welfare ESP target levels also present challenges. Finding individuals willing to make the necessary commitment to follow through with the programs is difficult. Another concern is placement in jobs that provide sufficient remuneration to more than offset welfare payments. Transportation and child care services are closely related issues and impact on services for this population.

It was identified that JTPA is a tougher program than the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act when providing for the hard-to-serve. One SDA cited limited documentation as a difficulty in the past when analyzing equitable services. Another SDA evaluates equity for each jurisdiction in the area to account for differences in the demographic make-up. Several SDAs indicated they make decisions based on the needs in the SDA. They do not become obsessed with service to priority groups. Instead they look at what can be done in the local situation and plan accordingly. Many administrators feel they can serve local needs and still meet state priorities.

4. What influence do performance standards have on the development of plans to serve the eligible populations?

The issue of performance standards is ever present. The majority of the SDAs indicate performance standards do not overtly influence planning decisions. The planning focus is on equitable services related to employment opportunities in the area. It is acknowledged that performance standards cannot be ignored. Achieving at least minimum attainment is a concern. Programs must be tailored to assure a reasonable level of success. A focus on the mix of programs helps balance performance standards results. Performance-based contracting incorporates the standards and assists in meeting established performance levels. One SDA stated that meeting performance standards is a management issue, not a planning issue. Another SDA related attaining performance standards too competing for

incentive grant funds available to those exceeding the standards. Competition among some SDAs is keen because incentive funds received increase the amount of administrative funds allowed for the SDA. The limit of 15 percent of the grant award for administration is an important issue with many SDAs. The competitive nature of the incentive funds provision was viewed by one SDA as needing revision.

JTPA performance is measured by the following categories:

1. Entered employment rate for adults
2. Cost per entered employment rate for adults
3. Average wage at placement for adults
4. Welfare entered employment rate for adults
5. Entered employment rate for youths
6. Positive termination rate for youths
7. Cost per positive termination for youths

Each SDA is required to meet four of the seven performance standards. The four standards reached must include the adult entered employment rate, the adult welfare entered employment rate, and the adult cost per entered employment. During each of the past several years Virginia has met its performance standards.

Program Year 1987 Performance

Performance Standard	Virginia Actual	Virginia Model	National Standard
Entered Employment Rate-Adult	75.15	59.49	62.00
Welfare Entered Employment Rate-Adult	65.16	47.57	51.00
Entered Employment Rate-Youth	52.54	39.80	43.00
Positive Termination Rate-Youth	84.00	73.98	75.00
Cost Per Entered Employment Rate-Adult	$2365.88	$4408.97	$4374.00
Cost Per Positive Termination Rate-Youth	$2061.21	$3619.02	$4900.00
Average Wage At Placement Rate-Adult	$ 4.77	$ 4.22	$ 4.91

TYPES OF TRAINING PROGRAMS PROVIDED

1. What are the major factors that influence decisions related to types of training programs provided?

Labor market information about types of jobs available, client ability level, and meeting client needs were identified by all SDAs as factors influencing programmatic decisions. Several also included previous success of the contractor, costs and time involved, and ability of the client to have transportation to the job.

Matching training with employment needs, documenting availability of jobs, assessing participants to determine ability and identify remedial education needed, establishing a training time frame clients can achieve, and assessing ability to meet transportation requirements of the job are interrelated issues involved in decisions about which programs are provided. Some SDAs noted short-term programs were effective for youth who are hard to recruit and keep. Performance contracting is used for these programs. Longer term programs usually involve adults who tend to have a greater commitment to complete programs.

2. What percentage of clients are enrolled in the various training programs, and what percentage of available funds are expended for these programs?

The GJTCC Program Year 1987 statewide data includes the following on program terminees and expenditures.

PY 1987 Title II-A Terminees	No. Youth	&%	No. Adults	&%
On-the-job training	719	21	1406	27
Classroom training	292	8	170	3
Institutional, vocational training	879	25	1511	29
Job search	929	26	1268	25
Training support	360	10	602	12
Supportive services	3	0	3	0
Work experience	34	1	9	0
Pre-employment training	200	6	5	0
Other	92	3	206	4
Total	3508	100	5108	100

PY 1987 Title II-A Expenditures

Youth	$11,753,000
Adults	$12,581,733

12.9%	on-the-job training
39.1%	classroom training
3.5%	supportive services
0.7%	employment generating
44.7%	other

(Percentages for types of training based on Program Year 1986 data.)

JTPA Funding *

Title	PY 1986	PY 1987
II-A	$26.3	$29.9
II-B	10.3	11.2
III	1.3	2.5
Total	$37.9	$43.6

* Funding levels reported in millions of dollars.

3. How does the private industry council view short-term training such as job search versus longer term institutional, vocational skill training. What has influenced this position?

Long-term versus short-term programs was not identified as a major concerns of private industry councils. Performance standards, clients to be served, and ability of clients to be employed at the end of the training play a greater role in these decisions. Longer term training may be viewed as having the greatest benefit for the client. One SDA indicated the PIC was not in favor of providing any allowances and this affects planning for long-term training programs. It was noted that most clients need more than job search services. One concern has to be the length of time the client is inclined to remain in the program.

COORDINATION BETWEEN JTPA AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

1. What coordination activities have taken place between JTPA and vocational education in the public schools and community colleges?

Coordination with vocational education is limited in many SDAs. There are a number of contractual arrangement for placement in community colleges and vocational skill centers. Several very good examples of coordination with school systems and community colleges were cited, but these were dominantly contracts for remedial general education and not for vocational education services. Vocational skill centers primarily serve JTPA clients, and in one SDA represent the total training program except for supported employment for handicapped clients.

Several SDAs noted staff members serve on vocational education advisory councils and vocational administrators and community college personnel serve on some PICs.

2. Are there factors that limit coordination between JTPA and vocational education?

A number of factors were identified that prohibit or limit coordination between JTPA and vocational education.

a. Community colleges and public schools are not willing to provide job placement required by performance contracting.

b. The variety of available vocational training is limited in relation to the jobs available.

c. Two-year programs in community colleges are too long for many clients. They need shorter programs.

d. The time of day services are available in public schools vocational programs restricts usage.

e. Some students who could benefit from JTPA programs do not meet income eligibility requirements.

f. JTPA and education, both public schools and community colleges, have different federal/state directives and approaches that dominate their efforts.

g. Personalities, concerns of jurisdictions, and lack of willingness to enter into new ventures and take some risks sometimes restricts opportunities for coordination.

h. Access for clients is limited by transportation obstacles.

i. There is a general lack of knowledge about each others programs and systems.

j. An ongoing system of communication to identify initiatives and opportunities for coordination is lacking.

k. Different funding procedures become an obstacle.

l. The geographic size of a large SDA limits regular involvement with vocational education personnel.

m. Staff time of SDAs is limited, which hampers developing truly coordinated programs.

n. The focus of public education in some school divisions is only on the K-12 program.

o. Requirements of JTPA frighten some vocational education administrators.

p. School divisions are not always willing to seek competitive grants.

q. Dropouts are reluctant to return to school for JTPA services.

r. School division vocational plans are not provided for review by private industry councils.

3. What is needed to expand coordination activities?

Many suggestions were made regarding how coordination activities might be expanded. In the discussions with SDAs, the need for personal contact with vocational and technical eduction personnel in public schools and community colleges was evident if any new and improved coordination activities are to take place.

a. Open discussion must take place between SDAs and vocational educators about the needs of students/clients and the plans or options to serve these needs.

b. Improve coordination at the state level between the Governor's Employment and Training Department and the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE). -Examples given were using the same language, definitions, and approach to the fullest extent possible.

c. Make public school vocational facilities available, on a contractual basis, after regular school hours and in the summer.

d. Schedule regular regional meetings to exchange information and explore new working relationships.

e. The Governor or state agency heads will have to mandate working together.

f. Vocational education should develop more customized skill training programs that directly relate to jobs available in the labor market.

g. Each SDA needs a staff member to establish and sustain linkages with educational institutions and agencies.

h. There is a need to work differently at the state level in education. Stronger ties should exist between adult basic education and vocational education, including the employment training service, so clients can receive fully integrated programs at the local level.

i. Vocational education in the public schools and community colleges needs to establish skill programs of six to twelve month periods.

j. More vocational education administrators should be on PICs to allow the development of a full understanding about JTPA.

k. Adult JTPA clients should be allowed to enroll in day programs of vocational education.

l. Establish more flexibility when designing community college occupational skill programs. Accept entrance and accommodate exit at times other than the regular college schedule.

m. Help educators in various jurisdictions, recognize that SDAs are there to serve their citizens.

n. Vocational education needs to get into the placement business. This is the only way to establish a real relationship with business and industry.

o. Vocational education needs to develop the ability to respond to request for proposals (RFPs).

STATE EDUCATION COORDINATION GRANTS

1. How are the cooperative agreements established between the Employment Training Service and the Service Delivery Area?

State education coordination funds totaling eight percent of the JTPA grant are administered by the Employment Training Service (ETS) in the Virginia Department of Education. Available funds are allocated to SDAs for programs and services. A representative of ETS meets with the SDA to identify how the funds will be utilized. This results in an agreement for each SDA.

The Employment Training Service in the Virginia Department of Education provided the following:

a. Funds were assigned to all SDAs.

b. Carryover funds were assigned to JTPA contractors to upgrade equipment.

c. Cooperative agreements were negotiated and completed with all SDAs.

d. Thirty-nine contracts were negotiated and completed with local education agencies (LEAs).

e. Staff visited LEAs and SDAs 123 times to provide technical assistance.

f. Plans were completed for the expenditure of funds during Program Year 1988.

g. In-service training was conducted for 100 JTPA instructors, counselors, and administrators.

h. In-service training was conducted for 60 GED instructors.

i. Sixty-one APTICOM Test Units (computerized assessment system) were provided to LEAs and SDAs to assess JTPA participants.

j. Three workshops were conducted in the use of the APTICOM Test Units.

k. In conjunction with the SDAs, 1,568 JTPA participants received training in occupational skills and/or basic skills.

2. How do these agreements evolve into services and training for eligible participants?

The ETS staff establishes contracts for the desired services. One SDA stated coordination grant funds are included in their request for proposals, then the ETS becomes involved and establishes contracts for services. Some SDAs use the coordination grant funds to support skill centers in their areas. A proposal for these services originates from the skill center and is received in the SDA, then ETS develops the contract for services.

3. Has there been difficulty in meeting the financial matching requirements for these funds? Explain.

JTPA requires a ten percent matching amount for the state education coordination grant funds. This matching amount can be for in-kind services, and there has not been any difficulty in meeting this requirement.

4. How has the expenditure of these funds affected coordination between JTPA and vocational education?

The response to this question was positive if the focus of coordination was the involvement of ETS in establishing contracts for services using coordination grant funds. These contracts with school divisions and community colleges involve the operation of skill centers, remedial basic skills, institutional skill training programs, individual referrals, and contracts with other service providers. There was indication that contracts expanding involvement with education was a goal in some SDAs.

5. What types of technical assistance have been provided by the Employment and Training Service in the Department of Education?

SDAs were positive in their responses about services provided by ETS. Everyone acknowledged assistance with the establishment of contracts for the education coordination grant funds. Other types of technical assistance identified were:

a. Evaluation of programs

b. Curriculum review and identification

c. Research of private career school accreditation

d. Serve on RFP review committees

e. Information source about statewide initiatives

f. Obtain training equipment

g. Resource when establishing competency-based system in training programs

h. Review and revise youth competency packages

i. Serve as contact with service provider using coordination grant funds

OTHER JTPA PROVISIONS

1. Are there provisions in federal regulations or state operational policy that are especially difficult to deal with?

Several provisions of JTPA were identified as being difficult to deal with.

a. Youth expenditure requirements

b. Funding and cost limitations create problems

c. Funding allocations should be based on the population in the area rather than on unemployment rates

d. Limitation on work experience for youth which is viewed as income transfer

e. Target percentage of dropouts to be served

f. Meeting adult entered employment rate for many people who need more services to enter skilled training

g. State may be too involved in the operation of JTPA

h. SDAs should determine services and direction of programs such as serving dropouts

i. Performance standards

j. Directives on how to spend incentive grant funds

k. State seeking uniformity, but lacking full consideration of differences in SDAs

l. Too many state directives reduce SDA flexibility

m. The ten percent window should either be expanded or eliminated

n. Discontent with the way success is measured

2. Will recently proposed changes for JTPA related to follow-up have much effect on the SDA?

Most responses indicated there is little impact expected on the SDA under the new follow-up system. Concern was expressed about availability of the follow-up data from a state-run system, and one SDA said they would prefer to do the follow-up in their area. It was noted that long-term placement/retention may be a problem for clients not in skill training programs under a contractor who is required to do placement. Another reaction was there is no worry unless quick fix programs are emphasized. One SDA questioned if thirteen weeks is a long enough period to judge retention. Concerns were expressed about low return rates. The system may not be capturing good data, and lack of control at the SDA level is creating uncertainty. It was also stated that retention on the job should not be viewed as the only measure of success of a program.

JTPA goals are to increase employment, to increase earnings, and to reduce welfare dependency of participants. The GETD has established a follow-up system to measure the accomplishment of these goals to assist in evaluating the effectiveness of the JTPA program in Virginia.

Follow-up data for the 13th week following termination is collected on a centralized basis by a contractor. The following represents follow-up data collected for Program Year 1987 for Title II-A adults in the JTPA program.

PY 1987 Follow-up Data	Adults	Adults (Welfare)
Employment Rate	68.26%	62.28%
Average Weekly Earnings	$185.90	$168.18
Average No. of Weeks Worked	9.85	9.08
Sample Size	6,976	1,792
Response Rate	58.36%	57.96%

3. Have you funded job generating economic development activities?

Some involvement in employment generating/economic development efforts were identified by several SDAs. It was noted that only small amounts of funds have been used for these activities. There are not enough resources available to make this a major SDA initiative. Several examples of employment generating activities were given.

a. Support of some economic development efforts

b. Aggressive assistance in plant location creating a number of jobs for the area

c. Support of jurisdictions meeting state economic development standards for the community certification program

d. Support for a small business center

e. Bus transportation service for clients to get to jobs that were otherwise inaccessible

f. Support of Chamber of Commerce economic development publication initiatives in several jurisdictions

4. Describe your youth programs/summer youth programs.

Youth programs under Title II-A are primarily in-school programs between September and June. Job readiness, remedial basic skills, and some work experience were identified as types of services provided. Summer youth programs were identified as basically work experience programs for students returning to school with some remedial education.

An average of forty percent of the II-A allocation received by SDAs must be used for youths (Ages 16-21). For Program Year 1987, 7,969 economically disadvantaged youths were served.

The GETD is working with businesses throughout Virginia to establish a Private Sector Mentorship Program that will utilize persons from the business community as mentors. The purpose of this program is to involve businesses in the hiring of youths from

the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program. A mentor will be assigned to each youth to provide counseling, career guidance, encouragement, lifelong goals, and opportunities to explore the inner workings of a specific part or parts of a business.

The II-B Summer Program for economically disadvantages youths offers job training, work maturity skills, on-the-job experiences, and remedial education. The 1988 Summer Youth Program served 8,193 youths (ages 14-21). These funds are used in various ways to help youths obtain jobs or to assist them in preparing for the job market.

In 1986, remedial education became a required activity of the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (SYETP). In the 1987 SYETP, the first year of the implementation of the new requirement, Virginia's SDAs provided remedial education to 2,272 participants out of a total of 8,022, or 28 percent. In the 1988 SYETP, the SDAs provided remedial education to 2,465 participants out of a total of 8,193, or 30 percent.

In 1988, youths, aged 14-21 who excelled in their local JTPA Summer Youth Program, participated in three days of workshops, lectures, social functions, and worked in small groups to develop an individualized one-year plan of action for continuing their education and/or obtaining productive employment.

5. What works best in JTPA?

A variety of responses were provided to this question.

a. The make-up of the private industry council which involves business representatives with social service people working as a team.

b. Dedicated service contractors.

c. Skill training and supportive services which prepare people for employment. This is especially critical for the population that is unskilled with no work experience.

d. The ability to reduce costs by coordinating efforts. It also requires knowing something about everything.

e. Good assessments that match people with the right services that results in placement in a job.

f. Local authority for the program.

g. The involvement and vested interest of the private sector.

h. Flexibility in the Act that allows a variety of approaches to local problems.

6. What would you like to see changed?

   The following changes were suggested:

   a. Reduce the uncertainty about funding. JTPA is a big improvement over CETA, but ups and downs damage programs.

   b. Provide greater continuity in programs.

   c. Eliminate the dropout target levels.

   d. Revise the incentive award process so focus is more on the provision of quality service.

   e. Change the JTPA eligibility criteria. Many in near poverty level are more motivated and interested in improvement but cannot be served.

   f. Increase the administrative cost level to allow more staff to create linkages and develop programs.

   g. Revise the client eligibility process to reduce required documentation.

   h. Eliminate performance standards and establish other accountability measures.

   i. Establish greater flexibility for SDA operation.

   j. Incorporate a range in performance standards, such as for costs, to preclude competition between SDAs that is detrimental.

   k. Change the allocation formula. Move away from unemployment rates.

   l. Reduce the constant changes being made in the program.

   m. New provisions in law should be reviewed by sub-state groups for suggestions on how they can best be implemented.

7. Are there other things in JTPA that we should be asking about?

   The role of elected officials in JTPA, the number of SDAs using the ten percent window for non-disadvantaged clients, and the use of on-the-job training were identified as questions that should be asked.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS

The delivery system under the Job Training Partnership Act is achieving the general purposes of the Act. The combined efforts of the Governor's Job Training Coordinating Council, Governor's Employment and Training Department, and the Private Industry Councils and administrators of the service delivery areas are responsible for these accomplishments. Expanding coordination between JTPA and vocational education will depend on the ability of all parties to overcome real obstacles. These include the unwillingness and/or inability of school divisions and community colleges to agree to performance contracts. Some do, but meeting the performance standards, especially placement, remains an obstacle. Several JTPA contractors access vocational-technical education through sub-contracts. Another factor limiting expanded coordination is the success level current service providers are achieving. Past performance of a provider is an important measure when contracting for services, and it should be. With funding levels remaining the same or lower there is little room for new contractors to access the system. Probably the greatest obstacle is the lack of ongoing communication between the parties involved. There certainly are examples of excellent communication and working relationships, but these must greatly be expanded if the two programs are to achieve higher levels of coordination.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO EXPAND COORDINATION BETWEEN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND JTPA

1. Improved Communication

A lack of regular contact between administrators of vocational education and JTPA precludes the opportunity for much additional coordination to take place. Some system, either formal or informal, should be established to create an environment for the exchange of information and for exploring new joint ventures.

The council therefore recommends that a system of ongoing communication be established between administrators in public schools and community colleges with administrators of JTPA service delivery areas.

2. Employment Training Service

The Employment Training Service (ETS) of the Virginia Department of Education, is responsible for administering the JTPA state education coordination grant funds. In this capacity, ETS is in regular contact with SDA administrators and many representatives of vocational-technical education at the secondary and community college levels. These contacts, and additional contacts with vocational education personnel, should be utilized to the fullest to explore new coordinated initiatives between JTPA and vocational education.

The council therefore recommends the role of the Employment Training Service be expanded to include a responsibility to facilitate new coordinated initiatives between vocational education and JTPA programs.

COUNCIL ACTIVITIES

A. PUBLIC MEETINGS AND PROGRAM VISITS

The council held two public meetings during the period covered by this report. In April, 1987, a public meeting was held on the campus of Wytheville Community College, Wytheville. Eighty-two people attended the meeting and twenty-one individuals presented remarks. The public meeting in May, 1988, was held at James Monroe High School in Fredericksburg. Sixty-three persons attended the meeting and twenty-two presented remarks to the council. Public meetings have been a useful strategy for gathering information about issues related to vocational education. Remarks at each public meeting are transcribed and copies of the full proceedings are provided to persons attending the session.

Program visits were conducted in two areas of the state. In November, 1987, teams of council members visited vocational-technical program in the New River Valley area. New River Community College and school divisions in Montgomery County, Pulaski County, and Radford were the sites for these visits. During October, 1988, the council visited programs in the Covington area. Jackson River Vocational Center, Botetourt County Public Schools, and Dabney S. Lancaster Community College were included in these site visits. Additionally, the council toured the Westvaco Corporation plant to see the world's largest bleached board paper making machine.

B. STATE PLAN CONSULTATION

The council's early review of vocational education programs and activities revealed a need to more closely align some program improvement funds with several purposes of the Act. Initiatives related to economic development, adult training and retraining, strengthening the basics, and coordination between secondary and postsecondary programs were needed. The following activities were presented for inclusion in the FY 1989 and FY 1990 state plan. Approximately ninety-five percent of these initiatives were incorporated in the plan.

1. Economic Development

    a. Provide scholarships for vocational administrators to participate in the economic development personnel training seminars sponsored by the Department of Economic Development.

    b. Develop a brochure highlighting vocational education's ability to support economic development.

c. Identify resources for customized training for existing business and industry.

d. Require new program funds be used for high demand occupations or those with the most rapid growth patterns.

2. Training And Retraining Adults

a. Identify resources for use in training adults for high demand occupations in areas of the state where such job openings exist.

b. Identify resources for adult training and retraining for adults in areas of the state identified as economically depressed.

3. Personnel Development

a. Include provisions for teacher in-service training on strengthening the basics through vocational curriculums.

b. Expand technical in-service for teachers to include both public school and community college personnel where possible.

4. Articulation Between Community Colleges, Public Schools, And The Private Sector

a. Expand the "2+2" program concept in five additional community college regions each year of the plan.

b. Encourage the development of joint regional plans to serve adults in high demand occupations.

5. Marketing Vocational Education

a. Provide resources for follow-through efforts with the marketing program products during the state plan period.

b. Develop an updated publication with the Department of Economic Development.

C. CONTACTS WITH ORGANIZED LABOR

Council members met with representatives of organized labor to identify issues and concerns about vocational-technical education. Several meetings were held with the leadership of the AFL-CIO. It was decided in these session to meet with representatives of

the union's central labor councils. The council was placed on the agenda of a state conference of central labor councils in August, 1987. This opportunity provided the identification of several concerns. It was suggested that council representatives attend meetings of the central labor councils in order to develop a further dialogue with union members. Several central labor council meetings were attended, and the following represents a summary of the concerns expressed in these sessions and earlier meetings.

1. Meaningful communication between vocational education and labor is limited. Labor representatives are somewhat involved with vocational education advisory councils, but this involvement should be expanded to establish an ongoing dialogue throughout the state. This involvement and other communication approaches should evolve through initiatives from vocational education and from labor.

2. Linkages between vocational education and apprenticeship training need to be strengthened and expanded.

3. Guidance counselors and teachers are not fully aware of the many apprenticeship training opportunities or the availability and benefits of vocational education programs.

4. The attitude of some teachers is extremely negative toward organized labor. This is based on a lack of understanding about organized labor, and perpetuated by the void of information related to labor in the educational curriculum.

5. There is a need to expand efforts to upgrade the skills of journeymen through adult vocational education programs. This need is driven by occupational skill changes and changes in industry. There no longer are strict jurisdictional lines for occupational crafts. Pipefitters, carpenters, and electricians, for example have shifted to a category of maintenance journeyman with multi-craft responsibilities.

D. SURVEY OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVES

The council conducted a survey of business and industry representatives throughout the state to determine how they viewed vocational-technical education programs in public schools and community colleges. Survey questions focused on the respondents' knowledge about vocational-technical programs, employee training experiences, vocational-technical education understanding the needs of business and industry, and what changes should take place in these programs. Local vocational-technical education advisory council chairs, administrators, and community college deans and provosts were involved in the distribution of the survey.

1. Are you aware of the vocational-technical education programs provided in the public schools and community colleges in the area? Responses: 110 (yes) 1(no)

   Comments: Business and industry representatives are aware of the programs in public schools and community colleges, but comments reflect that awareness is sometimes focused on a few programs. Involvement on advisory councils or committees was noted in several comments. The desire to know more about the programs and concerns about the need to improve the image of vocational education was expressed.

2. Do the vocational-technical education programs in the public schools/ community colleges contribute toward meeting employment needs in the community or region they serve? Responses: 104 (yes) 3 (no) 4 (no answer)

   Comments: The responses indicated the programs do contribute to meeting the employment needs in the area. Concern was expressed that skilled workers are still in high demand. The health field and technical fields were cited as examples where needs exist. A greater effort should be made to correlate the training offered with the needs of the industries in the area. It was noted that vocational education should make an appeal to more gifted students. Another response suggested helping more at-risk students through vocational education.

3. How many people are employed by the business or industry you represent? Responses: 37 (0-25) 10 (25-50) 9 (50-100) 54 (more than 100) 1 (no answer)

4. Have individuals from your business or industry participated in job-related training or retraining provided through the vocational-technical education program in public schools/community colleges within the past two years? Responses: 76 (yes) 34 (no) 1 (no answer)

   If answer is yes, what was the quality of the training or retraining? Responses: 36 (above average) 35 (average) 2 (below average)? 3 (no answer)

   Comments: Positive comments from several respondents identified the related instruction provided apprentices. Updating skills of workers was noted and the flexibility and responsiveness of the community college to serve an industry's needs was expressed. One comment indicated programs are popular with their employees. Another reported that ten percent of their employees have attended the community college. The need to have programs that were more closely matched to the needs of industry was also included in the comments.

5. Do you anticipate employees in your business will need additional training or retraining during the next eighteen months? Responses: 72 (yes) 35 (no) 4 (no answer)

Comments: The need for continuous training for new and upgraded skills was expressed in several comments. Using computers in word processing, drafting, and data management was mentioned. One response noted the technological advances in equipment makes training in operations and safety a necessity. The health care industry was cited as needing to be more aggressive in requesting training and retraining. Another response indicated a one-third expansion in the business in six months would require training for new employees.

6. Do you feel vocational-technical education understands the education and training needs of your business or industry? Responses: 81 (yes) 23 (no) 7 (no answer)

   If answer is no, what could be done to change this?

   Comments: Ten of the twenty-seven comments referenced the critical need to establish communication between the provider of training and the business and industry needing the training. Personal contacts, surveys, visits to work sites, and ongoing assessments were mentioned. More awareness of the impact of changing technology on the work place was also noted. Several comments stated the unique needs of their business was not recognized or understood by the educators.

7. What changes would you like to see take place in vocational-technical education in the public schools/community colleges?

   Comments: Eighty-two of the surveys returned included a response to this question. The comments emphasized several themes. Dominant was the need for communication between business and industry and education. The identification of the training needed and designing training packages to meet these needs was mentioned. One response called for a hand-in-hand approach. Concern about students learning more than just occupational skills was expressed. The work ethic, attitudes, communication skills, good work habits, and functioning as a part of a team were highlighted. One respondent made a statement about the need for more depth within the vocational curriculums. Several responses indicated the need for highly qualified instructors. It was noted that community colleges should play a larger role in training and retraining. The need for expanded cooperation between schools and colleges was also mentioned.

E. BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY PARTNERSHIP AWARDS

The council, in 1987, initiated a recognition program for business and industry partnerships with vocational-technical education. This effort to recognize outstanding partnerships was incorporated with a program established by the Virginia Department of

Education to promote excellence in vocational education in the public schools. The council's awards program includes recognition of business and industry partnership with school divisions and community colleges. Twenty awards were presented during the first two years of the program.

1987 PARTNERSHIP AWARDS

Ameurop Cultural Relations Foundation
Nominated by Henrico County Public Schools

Systems Management American Corporation
Nominated by Norfolk Public Schools

The Chamber of Commerce for Fredericksburg, Stafford, and Spotsylvania
Nominated by Fredericksburg, Stafford, and Spotsylvania Public Schools

May Centers
Nominated by Arlington County Public Schools

E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company
Nominated by Valley Vocational-Technical Center

Bedford County Memorial Hospital
Nominated by Bedford County Public Schools

Bristol Home Builders Association
Nominated by Bristol Public Schools

Adolph Coors Company - Shenandoah Brewery
Nominated by Blue Ridge Community College

Federal Paper Board Company, Inc.
Nominated by John Tyler Community College

The MITRE Corporation
Nominated by Northern Virginia Community College, Annandale Campus

Norfolk Naval Shipyard
Nominated by Tidewater Community College, Frederick Campus

1988 PARTNERSHIP AWARDS

Bedford Educational Center Auto Craft Committee
Nominated by Bedford County Public Schools

The Chamber of Commerce for Fredericksburg, Stafford, and Spotsylvania
Nominated by Fredericksburg, Stafford County, and Spotsylvania County Public Schools

Fairfax County Vocational Education Foundation, Inc.
Nominated by Fairfax County Public Schools

N. C. R. Data Processing Center
Nominated by Chesapeake Public Schools

Virginia Power
Nominated by Colonial Heights Public Schools

Colonial Auto Group
Nominated by Tidewater Community College, Chesapeake Campus

Dan River, Inc.
Nominated by Danville Community College

Time-Life Customer Service
Nominated by J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College, Parham Road Campus

WESTVACO Corporation
Nominated by Dabney S. Lancaster Community College

APPENDIX

VIRGINIA JTPA SERVICE DELIVERY AREAS

1. SDA - One, Inc.

   Counties: Buchanan, Dickenson, Lee, Russell, Scott, Tazewell, Wise
   City: Norton

2. New River/Mount Rogers Employment and Training Consortium

   Counties: Bland, Carroll, Floyd, Giles, Grayson, Montgomery, Pulaski, Smyth, Washington, Wythe
   Cities: Bristol, Galax, Radford

3. Fifth District Employment and Training Consortium

   Counties: Alleghany, Botetourt, Craig, Roanoke
   Cities: Clifton Forge, Covington, Roanoke, Salem

4. Shenandoah Valley Service Delivery Area

   Counties: Augusta, Bath, Clarke, Frederick, Highland, Page, Rockbridge, Rockingham, Shenandoah, Warren
   Cities: Buena Vista, Harrisonburg, Lexington, Staunton, Waynesboro, Winchester

5. Northern Virginia Manpower Consortium

   Counties: Fairfax, Loudoun, Prince William
   Cities: Fairfax, Falls Church, Manassas, Manassas Park

6. Alexandria/Arlington Job Training Consortium

   County: Arlington
   City: Alexandria

7. Piedmont Job Training Administration

   Counties: Albermarle, Culpeper, Fauquier, Fluvanna, Greene, Louisa, Madison, Nelson, Orange, Rappahannock
   City: Charlottesville

8. Central Piedmont Employment Consortium

Counties:	Amherst, Appomattox, Bedford, Campbell, Franklin, Henry, Patrick, Pittsylvania
Cities:	Bedford, Danville, Lynchburg, Martinsville

9. South Central Employment and Training Consortium

Counties:	Amelia, Brunswick, Buckingham, Charlotte, Cumberland, Dinwiddie, Greensville, Halifax, Lunenburg, Mecklenburg, Nottoway, Prince Edward, Prince George, Surry, Sussex
Cities:	Colonial Heights, Emporia, Farmville, Hopewell, Petersburg, South Boston

10. Job and Training Assistance Programs

City:	Richmond

11. Capital Area Training Consortium

Counties:	Charles City, Chesterfield, Goochland, Hanover, Henrico, New Kent, Powhatan

12. Bay Consortium Private Industry Council, Inc.

Counties:	Accomack, Caroline, Essex, King and Queen, King George, King William, Lancaster, Mathews, Middlesex, Northampton, Northumberland, Richmond, Spotsylvania, Stafford, Westmoreland
City:	Fredericksburg

13. Job Training Service

Counties:	Gloucester, James City, York
Cities:	Hampton, Newport News, Poquoson, Williamsburg

14. Southeastern Virginia Job Training Administration

Counties:	Isle of Wight, Southampton
Cities:	Chesapeake, Franklin, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Suffolk, Virginia Beach

The Virginia Council on Vocational Education does not discriminate against employees or applicants on the basis of race, sex, handicap, age, veteran status, national origin, religion, or political affilitation,

For further information, contact:

Virginia Council on Vocational Education
7420-A Whitepine Road
Richmond, Virginia 23237

Phone: (804) 275-6218